

From: [OMEALY Mikell](#)
To: [Chris Thompson](#)
Cc: [jeremy_buck@fws.gov](#); [PETERSON Jenn L](#); [POULSEN Mike](#); [Robert.Neely@noaa.gov](#); [Joe Goulet/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Dana Davoli/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Ron Gouquet](#); [Chris Thompson](#); [rgensemer@parametrix.com](#); [Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [ANDERSON Jim M](#); [Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#)
Subject: RE: Thoughts regarding agenda items for Monday's meeting
Date: 03/30/2006 05:45 PM

Great suggestions, Chris. Thanks very much. I will take a crack at listing some of the main issues I've heard from you and others in my conversations and I'll send that out with the agenda.

For everyone -- please feel free to send me a quick email today/early tomorrow mentioning your top areas of disagreement/concern with the framework document. It's always better to be able to have your words, rather than my interpretation of our conversation.

Thanks,
Mikell

-----Original Message-----

From: Chris Thompson [mailto:chris.thompson@eiltld.net]
Sent: Thursday, March 30, 2006 4:39 PM
To: OMEALY Mikell
Cc: [jeremy_buck@fws.gov](#); [PETERSON Jenn L](#); [POULSEN Mike](#); [Robert.Neely@noaa.gov](#); [Goulet.Joe@epamail.epa.gov](#); [Davoli.Dana@epamail.epa.gov](#); [Ron Gouquet](#); [Chris Thompson](#); [rgensemer@parametrix.com](#); [Humphrey.Chip@epamail.epa.gov](#); [ANDERSON Jim M](#); [Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov](#)
Subject: Thoughts regarding agenda items for Monday's meeting

OMEALY Mikell wrote:

>Thanks very much for the great thoughts you've shared with me about
>what you'd like to achieve in Monday's Centralia meeting. Attached is a

>draft agenda for your review. Please feel free to send me any comments
>or suggestions on this today. I'll plan on finalizing it tomorrow
>morning and sending it out to the whole group then.

>
>Thanks again,
>Mikell

>-----Original Message-----

>From: [Humphrey.Chip@epamail.epa.gov](#)
>[mailto:[Humphrey.Chip@epamail.epa.gov](#)]
>Sent: Friday, March 24, 2006 5:02 PM
>To: [audiehuber@ctuir.com](#); [ANDERSON Jim M](#); [cunninghame@gorge.net](#);
>[exec@envintl.com](#); [howp@critfc.org](#); [jean.lee@envintl.com](#);
>[jeremy_buck@fws.gov](#); [Smith.Judy@epamail.epa.gov](#);
>[Kawabata.Sylvia@epamail.epa.gov](#); [KEPLER Rick J](#); [tomd@ctsi.nsn.us](#);
>[Lori_Cora/R10/USEPA/US@epamail.epa.gov](#); [Sheldrake.Sea@epamail.epa.gov](#);

>[Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov](#); [joe@nezperce.org](#); [MCCLINCY Matt](#);
>[struck.rodney@deg.state.or.us](#); [PETERSON Jenn L](#); [POULSEN Mike](#);
>[Fuentes.Rene@epamail.epa.gov](#); [Black.Curt@epamail.epa.gov](#);
>[Robert.Neely@noaa.gov](#); [emadden@ecoisp.com](#); [Goulet.Joe@epamail.epa.gov](#);
>[Davoli.Dana@epamail.epa.gov](#); [jeff.baker@grandronde.org](#);
>[Shephard.Burt@epamail.epa.gov](#); OMEALY Mikell;
>[Koch.Kristine@epamail.epa.gov](#); [TOEPEL Kathryn](#); [Rose Longoria](#)
>Subject: Project Meeting to discuss Scale (as in risk)/Facilitator
>for Framework Discussions

>
>
>Two quick items before Eric and I check out for Spring Break

>
>1) We have asked Mikell OMealy to facilitate planning for the Eco/HH
>Subgroup meeting April 3rd (internal meeting on "scale") and April
>11th (meeting with LWG to discuss the eco framework), and to be our
>facilitator for the April 3rd and April 11 meetings. Mikell will be
>sending out further details & instructions soon, which will include
>reviewing the LWG's Eco Framework Document. Please work with Mikell
>so we can have a productive discussion on the 3rd and start our
>preparations for meeting with LWG on the April 11th.

>2) A few details and initial thoughts on April 3rd - The SCALE Meeting

>
>Location: Centralia, Washington - Olympic Club (Joe - this is
>reserved, right?)
>Time: 9:30am to 3:30pm

>
>Mikell will be developing the agenda with input from the group. Here
>are some thoughts about what we need to accomplish. Basically, we are
>trying to come up with an approach to answer those nagging questions
>about the appropriate scale(s) of the risk assessment.

>
>1) What are the options for looking a scale, (ie, site-wide, point by
>point, intermediate). What basis - home range, AOPC, physical
>constraints, habitat, etc. Is the LWG Eco Framework document the
>appropriate vehicle for moving forward?

>2) Eco and HH overlap on scale discussions, framework discussions.
>
>2) Other examples - Ron Gouguet, NOAA discussion on approaches used at
>other sites.
>
>3) What difference do the different approaches make in determining
>site
>risk? - Parametrix thoughts on looking at different assumptions for
>exposure estimates; ie preliminary risk calculations (via Eco and HH
>hazard quotients, existing TRVs) for example chemicals using a couple
>of example receptors (including human health from fish consumption
>pathway).
>
>4) Preparation for the April 11 meeting with the LWG - this meeting
>will focus on the LWG's framework for eco
>
>
>
>If time allows, we will also need to have a short discussion on the PRE
>comments.
>
>
>
>
Hi Mikell,

In general I like your agenda Mikell; however, as we discussed during
our conference call today, there is a lot of ground to cover - indeed,
much more than we can cover in one day. So, as always, the better
prepared that people are coming into the meeting the better off we will
be. You have already talked at length with most/all of the ecoteam, and

possibly others, about our concerns regarding the Ecorisk framework
document, e.g., lack of attention to water data (Jenn's comment), use of

benthic interpretative approach (modeled data) as the primary line of
evidence (over empirical data that are being given less weight) to
assess risk to the benthic community, intent to delay any additional
biological data collection until after completion of the Round 2
Comprehensive report (and the associated certainty of not meeting the
ROD deadline if they do so), etc. As a result, you have a good handle
on what concerns exist regarding LWG's framework. My suggestion is that

you summarize these concerns into a set of issues/questions to be
discussed, i.e. added to the agenda. This does not, of course, preclude

discussion of other concerns, but it does alert people to issues that
have already been identified. Second, when you send out the agenda,
tell people that they need to carefully and critically read the framework

document and come prepared to discuss it on Monday.

Thanks,

Chris

--

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS E-MAIL MESSAGE IS LEGALLY PRIVILEGED
AND CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION INTENDED SOLELY FOR THE USE OF THE PERSONS
OR ENTITIES NAMED ABOVE. IF YOU ARE NOT SUCH PERSONS OR ENTITIES, YOU
ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT ANY DISTRIBUTION, DISSEMINATION OR REPRODUCTION
OF THIS E-MAIL MESSAGE IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED
THIS MESSAGE IN ERROR, PLEASE IMMEDIATELY CALL US AT 206-525-3362.

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS E-MAIL MESSAGE IS CONFIDENTIAL
INFORMATION INTENDED SOLELY FOR THE USE OF PERSONS OR ENTITIES NAMED
ABOVE. IF YOU ARE NOT SUCH PERSONS OR ENTITIES, YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED
THAT ANY DISTRIBUTION, DISSEMINATION OR REPRODUCTION OF THIS E-MAIL
MESSAGE IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS MESSAGE IN
ERROR, PLEASE IMMEDIATELY CALL US AT 206-525-3362.